

REMARKS

Applicants submit the priority application and drawings as originally filed and have made amendments as summarized below.

The Cross-Reference to Related Applications section has been added to identify the application as a Continuation application, which claims priority from copending U.S. application 09/568,555.

Claims 6, 17, and 18 have been deleted.

Claims 7 and 8 have been amended to claim from claim 1 instead of claim 6.

Claim 12, line 22, has been amended to delete "actual size" before "medication icon" and insert "an actual size" before "color image of a medication" to more clearly show that the image of the medication is of actual size.

Claim 20, has been amended to correct a typographical error by replacing the colon (:) after the word "system" on line 21 with a semicolon (;).

No new matter has been added, and no amendment is related to the statutory requirements of patentability or for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim within the meaning of *Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co. Ltd.*, No. 95-1066 (Fed. Cir. September 26, 2003).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 1-17 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Goetz et al (USPN 6,421,650, hereinafter "Goetz") in view of Reiner et al (USPN 5,691,932, hereinafter "Reiner").

As per independent claim 1, this claim has now been clarified to amend the previously claimed combination to now include the limitation that:

"said medication icon showing an actual size color image of a medication to be taken by the patient" [underlining for clarity]

The support for the amendment is in Specification page 5, lines 15-16:

“The medication that is indicated in FIG. 1 appears as a medication icon 32. In FIG. 1, a tablet is shown in its full size and color.”

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Goetz and Reiner taken as a whole does not teach or suggest the present invention as now claimed in claim 1.

As per independent claim 12, the claim originally claimed an actual size medication icon, which those having ordinary skill in the art would understand to mean that the icon was the actual size of the medication. In the interests of clarity, the claim 12 language has been clarified to indicate that the medication icon shows an actual size image of the medication. This language parallels the language now in claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Goetz and Reiner taken as a whole did not and does not teach or suggest the present invention as claimed in claim 12.

As per claims 2 and 13, these dependent claims respectively depend from independent claims 1 and 12, and are believed to be allowable since they contain all the limitations set forth in the independent claim from which they depend and claim additional unobvious combinations thereof.

As per claims 3 and 14, these dependent claims respectively depend indirectly from independent claims 1 and 12, and are believed to be allowable since they contain all the limitations set forth in the independent claim from which they depend and claim additional unobvious combinations thereof.

As per claims 6, 7, and 17, claims 6 and 17 have been cancelled and claim 7 has been amended to depend from independent claim 1 and is believed to be allowable since it contains all the limitations set forth in the independent claim from which it depends and claims additional unobvious combinations thereof.

As per amended claim 8 and claim 19, these dependent claims respectively depend from independent claims 1 and 12, and are believed to be allowable since they contain all the

limitations set forth in the independent claim from which they depend and claim additional unobvious combinations thereof.

As per claims 9 and 20, these dependent claims respectively depend from independent claims 1 and 12, and are believed to be allowable since they contain all the limitations set forth in the independent claim from which they depend and claim additional unobvious combinations thereof.

As per claims 10 and 21, these dependent claims respectively depend from independent claims 1 and 12, and are believed to be allowable since they contain all the limitations set forth in the independent claim from which they depend and claim additional unobvious combinations thereof.

As per claims 11 and 22, these dependent claims respectively depend from independent claims 1 and 12, and are believed to be allowable since they contain all the limitations set forth in the independent claim from which they depend and claim additional unobvious combinations thereof.

Claims 4, 5, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Goetz et al. (USPN 6,421,650, hereinafter "Goetz")/Reiner et al. (USPN 5,691,932, hereinafter "Reiner") in view of Brown (USPN 6,168,563, hereinafter "Brown").

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Goetz/Reiner and Brown taken as a whole does not teach or suggest the present invention as now claimed in claims 1 and 12.

As per claims 4 and 15, these dependent claims respectively depend from independent claims 1 and 12, and are believed to be allowable since they contain all the limitations set forth in the independent claim from which they depend and claim additional unobvious combinations thereof.

As per claims 5 and 16, these dependent claims respectively depend indirectly from independent claims 1 and 12, and are believed to be allowable since they contain all the limitations set forth in the independent claim from which they depend and claim additional unobvious combinations thereof.

The other references cited by the Examiner showing the prior art have been considered and are not believed to disclose, teach, or suggest, either singularly or in combination, Applicants' invention as claimed.

Conclusion

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amended changes. Allowance of claims 1-5 7-16, and 19-22 at an early date is solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including any extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,



Mikio Ishimaru
Registration No. 27,449

The Law Offices of Mikio Ishimaru
1110 Sunnyvale-Saratoga Rd., Suite A1
Sunnyvale, CA 94087
Telephone: (408) 738-0592
Fax: (408) 738-0881
Date: October 31, 2003